



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV.—THE ORIGIN OF THE ACCENTUAL PROSE RHYTHM IN GREEK.

The first appearance of a well developed accentual rhythm in Greek prose falls at some time between 300 and 400 A. D. The older prose rhythm based on quantity at this time became obsolete, and the new principle of accentuation by stress instead of pitch, which was already well established in the spoken language, was recognized and adopted by the literary language. At about the same time there appeared in Latin prose an accentual rhythm which is practically the same as that in Greek. In both cases the rhythm consists in a careful arrangement of word accents at the ends of clauses by which the last two spoken accents are separated by either two or four unstressed syllables.¹ The question now is: was this rhythm developed in one of the languages, and taken over ready made by the writers of the other, or did it grow up independently in each?

For several centuries before the introduction of this accentual rhythm writers of prose, both Latin and Greek, had used a rhythm which was based on syllabic quantity. This particular quantitative rhythm, which was common to both languages, is generally believed to have originated in the Asianic school of Greek Oratory in the third century B. C., when Hegesias of Magnesia and others abandoned the flowing periodic style of the Attic Orators, and introduced in its place the so-called "commatic style", which was characterized by a choppy sentence structure and a rhythm which seemed to later critics to give too much of a sing-song effect by its extreme regularity. The rhythm used by these writers was primarily a rhythm of *clausulae*; a certain number of metrical forms were selected and used as closing cadences of commata and of cola. The Attic Orators had avoided this artificial limitation of accepted rhythmical forms,

¹The accentual prose rhythm was first explained by Wilhelm Meyer: "Der accentuirte Satzschluss in der griechischen Prosa vom IV bis XVI Jahrhundert", Göttingen, 1891; the law regulating the arrangement of accents in clausulae has been known since that time as Meyer's Law.

and had allowed no such monotonous repetition of similar metrical combinations at the ends of clauses. But in spite of the many faults of the Asianic style, and the almost universal condemnation which it received, the prose rhythm which the Asianists introduced found many imitators, even among their critics. It was only natural that the Roman orators of the first century B. C. should have been under the influence of Hegesias and other Asianic writers as well as their greater predecessors, and the rhythm at least of the commatic style was, with some reserve, adopted by them. The case is fairly plain in Cicero; he follows the Asianists in showing especial care for the rhythm of his clausulae, and in the choice of the particular rhythms used. This quantitative rhythm, therefore, which originated in Greek at about 300 B. C., was taken over into Latin, and continued in use in both languages until the accentual rhythm came into use in the fourth century. Nothing could be more natural than to suppose that the common quantitative rhythm passed naturally into the common accentual rhythm in the two languages independently and at the same time. This is exactly the thing which I shall attempt to prove did *not* happen.

The situation in Latin is comparatively simple; it has been recognized by those who have written on the subject that there must have been some kind of a direct development from a quantitative to an accentual scheme *in Latin*. The transition from the one to the other was a perfectly natural, and perhaps unconscious process. It is only in regard to the details of the process that there can be any disagreement. In the first centuries after Christ the forms of the quantitative rhythm which were considered desirable for clausulae became more limited in number, so that the great majority of clausulae could be classed under one of three heads: cretic-trochaic (e. g., *in parte naturae*), cretic-ditrochaic (e. g., *existimant nuncupari*) and dicretic (e. g., *aedificatur e motibus*). It was noticed by Louis Havet¹ and by Wilhelm Meyer² that all these quantitative Forms when read accentually correspond exactly to the regular Forms of the

¹ La prose métrique de Symmache; et les origines métriques du cursus. Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études, 94 (1892).

² Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinischen Rhythmik II, pp. 236-286 (Die rhythmische lateinische Prosa), esp. p. 261 ff. (This article was first printed as a review of Havet: La prose métrique de Symmache, in Gött. Gel. Anz. 1893.)

accentual rhythm; while the quantitative Forms which produce irregular accentual Forms are found to be in each case variations from the three typical Forms of clausulae given above, produced either by changing the position of the caesura, or by the resolution of long syllables. For example, the commonest quantitative Form, — ∪, — — ∪ (in *parte naturae*), which equals the regular accentual Form 2¹ (˘ ~, ~ ˘ ~), is frequently found in the modified form, — ∪, ∪ ∪ — ∪ (*tempus orietur*), or ∪ ∪ ∪, — — ∪ (*generis humani*); this resolution in each case produces the irregular accentual Form 3, ˘ ~ ~, ~ ˘ ~. This fact led Meyer to offer this explanation: when writers of rhythmical prose in the third and fourth century after Christ began to think in terms of word accent rather than syllabic quantity, the arrangement of word accents in the traditional types of clausulae came to be noted with increasing care, until the grouping of accents was regarded as the essential element in the rhythm of clausulae; at the same time the arrangement of syllabic quantities came to be more and more neglected, until they faded out, as it were, leaving the old shell for the new inhabitant. Thus the arrangement of word accents, which had been entirely secondary—the accidental result of the arrangement of syllabic quantities—came to be the essential element in the rhythm, while the quantities which had been the really essential element were gradually relegated to second place. A transition of this sort must have been gradual and for the most part unconscious. It was not effected by a deliberate substitution of accent for quantity; it came about because the accentual scheme *which was already present* in the traditional rhythm was kept, while the quantitative scheme was gradually neglected and forgotten.

A somewhat different explanation has been offered by J. J. Schlicher.² He gives as the reason for the change from quanti-

¹ The accentual Forms are here designated as Form 1, Form 2, etc.; the numeral in each case gives the number of unstressed syllables *between* the two *word-accent*s of the clausula. The regular accentual Forms are Forms 2, 4 and possibly 6, all having an *even* number of syllables between accents; the irregular accentual Forms are Forms 1, 3 and 5, all having an *uneven* number of syllables between accents. Of the irregular class Form 3 enjoys the greatest tolerance, so that in some writers it is found to occur half as frequently as Form 4; in other writers its use is so limited that it must be regarded as one of the distinctly avoided class.

² Origin of Rhythmical Verse in Late Latin, Chicago, 1900, pp. 83 ff.

tative to accentual clausulae the increasing difficulty in handling syllabic quantities; this difficulty led to certain devices which accidentally produced the groupings of word accents which characterize the accentual rhythm. The details of this theory may be passed over; the essential point in relation to this discussion is this, that Schlicher agrees with Meyer in recognizing the close relation between the quantitative and the accentual rhythm, and the necessity of supposing some kind of a development from the one to the other. This is the only really important thing for our present purpose, and about it there cannot be the slightest doubt.¹

An examination of the clausulae of Latin writers of the third and fourth centuries shows plainly that the accentual rhythm existed in the quantitative rhythm, and that the only thing needed to suggest

	Form 1	Form 2	Form 3	Form 4	Form 5	Form 6
Fronto.....	18.5	38.5	23.5	16	2.5	1
Apuleius.....	16.3+	38	22.3+	18.6+	3.6+	1
Min. Felix....	2.5	32.5	31.5	31	2.5	0
Tertullian....	10.3+	46.3+	24	15	2.6+	1.6+
Cyprian.....	5.6+	49.6+	15.3+	28.3+	1	0
Arnobius.....	2.6+	63.2+	8.7+	23.6+	1.2+	.5+
Lactantius....	6	42.75	26.50	22.75	2	0
Eumenius....	3	39	31	26	1	0

the preferred accentual Forms was to read the quantitative clausulae accentually. This statement does not apply equally to all writers who used quantitative clausulae. Not *until* the third century is that particular phase of the quantitative rhythm found which marks the beginning of the transition. In the second century Fronto and Apuleius and Minucius Felix wrote with careful regard for the quantitative law of clausulae, but when their clausulae are read accentually there is found to be no suggestion of the later preference for the accentual Forms 2 and 4.² The same is true of Tertullian and Lactantius in the third century, as well as the panegyrist Eumenius. On the other hand Cyprian and Arnobius in the same century treated the quantitative rhythm

¹ The view of Louis Havet (*La prose métrique de Symmache*, p. 9f.), according to which the accentual rhythm as such first appeared in Latin in the twelfth century does not affect this discussion.

² Meyer: (*Ges. Abh.* II, p. 242) names Minucius as one of those writers whose clausulae suggested the accentual scheme.

in such a way that the effect of the accentual rhythm is distinctly present, in that the accentual Forms 2 and 4 predominate over all other accentual Forms. It has been found that the different accentual Forms occur in the clausulae of the writers named in about the above percentages.¹

Only in Cyprian and Arnobius do the regular accentual Forms 2 and 4 plainly predominate over all others.² The situation in Minucius Felix is striking in that Forms 2, 3 and 4 are so largely represented, but there is still no definite suggestion of the accentual rhythm, for in that rhythm it is essential that Form 3 be at least limited in use.

That limitation comes first in Cyprian, and more distinctly in Arnobius. The accentual law which obtains in their clausulae is not a law in itself at all, but only the accidental result of a carefully constructed *quantitative* rhythm which happened to avoid those quantitative Forms which show an uneven number of syllables between the two word accents of the clausula; this was accomplished by interpreting the quantitative law in its strictest sense and allowing the least possible variation from the typical Forms, both as to the position of the caesura and the resolution of long syllables. Thus the first definite suggestion of the accentual law is found in writers who constructed their clausulae on the basis of syllabic quantity only. In the following century it would appear that the Forms of clausulae which had been given preference by such writers as Cyprian and Arnobius came to be valued for their accentual cadence chiefly, and were so used first by Ammianus Marcellinus. Still the transition from a quantitative to an accentual base was a gradual one, for Ammianus still retained something of the traditional quantitative cadence in his clausulae, while his contemporary Symmachus

¹ The figures here given are based on tests which are admittedly limited in scope: only from 200 to 800 clausulae before heavy punctuation were counted in each writer; but this is sufficient to show in each case whether any suggestion of the accentual rhythm is present. Further investigation might show certain minor modifications to be necessary, but the proportions which are thus found to exist between the different accentual Forms are given as substantially correct for each writer.

² The same is true of the unknown author of the 5th Panegyric in the collection known as "xii Panegyrici Latini;" also in Pan. III by Mamertinus there is found this same suggestion of the accentual law, but not in Pan. II by the same writer.

shows the greatest care in making his clausulae conform to the quantitative law. After Ammianus other Latin writers took up the accentual rhythm, and it became a recognized ornament for all kinds of rhetorical prose.

The question of origin has not been so easy to settle on the Greek side. It has been recognized that the probability of an independent origin for the Greek accentual rhythm is very small, because the sameness of the rhythm in the two languages almost demands a common origin, and the generally accepted view has been that the rhythm was taken over by Greek writers from the Latin ready-made. A protest has been raised against this view by Prof. G. L. Hendrickson in a recent number of the *American Journal of Philology*.¹ He finds evidence of a direct development *in Greek* from the quantitative rhythm to the accentual rhythm in the Epistle to the Corinthians by Clement of Rome; there seems to be here a combination of the two systems, for both syllabic quantity and word accent appear to be used to mark the rhythm of clausulae. If this observation is correct, it is necessary to put the time of the beginning of the accentual rhythm three centuries earlier than the time heretofore believed to be correct.

Before taking up this view one point must be noted. The development which Professor Hendrickson supposes to have taken place is quite different from that which transformed Latin quantitative clausulae into accentual clausulae. Indeed the development could never have taken place along those lines in Greek, simply because the position of Greek word accents is regulated only in part by syllabic quantities,² and it is not within the reach of possibility that a fixed order of syllabic quantities could give a starting point for a fixed order of word accents in the way in which this took place in Latin. This may be made clear by examples. We may start from the quantitative unit cretic + trochee, the most frequent combination in the Asianic rhythm of Greek prose as well as Latin. This sequence of quantities can be represented in Greek in the following ways

¹ *Accentual Clausulae in Greek Prose of the First and Second Centuries of Our Era*, A. J. P. XXIX 3 (1908).

² It should be observed that only the *position* of word accents is to be considered, for in the accentual rhythm no distinction is made between acute, grave and circumflex: each kind of accent simply marks a *stressed* syllable.

(following the preference of the quantitative rhythm in allowing only a clausula of two words and a feminine caesura):

δεινός ἄνθρωπος	= (accentually) ~ ˘, ˘ ~ ~ (Form ο)
δεινοῦ ἀνθρώπου	= (") ~ ˘, ~ ˘ ~ (" 1)
ἄνθρωπος δεινός	= (") ˘ ~ ~, ~ ˘ (" 3)
δεινός Ἡρακλῆς	= (") ~ ˘, ~ ~ ˘ (" 2)
μίμος ἐνδαίμων	= (") ˘ ~, ~ ˘ ~ (" 2)

These examples are sufficient to make clear the point that Greek quantitative clausulae could never of themselves suggest *any* accentual rhythm, because in contrast to the Latin clausulae, the position of word accents has so little to do with syllabic quantity. A Greek of the fourth century, who pronounced his words with a stress accent, reading prose of an earlier period which was rhythmized on the basis of quantity, would find no regularly recurring groups of accents in clausulae; while he *would* find such regularly recurring groups of accents in the Latin prose of such writers as Cyprian and Arnobius, which had practically the same quantitative rhythm. It is necessary, therefore, to look for a different sort of development from a quantitative to an accentual basis; *if* Greek writers worked out the rhythm for themselves, they must have proceeded along quite different lines from those followed on the Latin side. And yet the result is the same in both languages. Judging the matter a priori, it seems improbable that the two languages should evolve independently the same accentual rhythm, when the development had to be of a distinctly different kind in each. It is agreed that both languages had the same quantitative rhythm to begin from; that rhythm had been developed by the Asianic school of Greek Oratory and borrowed by the Latin writers; but it still remains difficult to account for the production in Greek of an accentual rhythm in most respects like that in Latin, although there is no possibility of the same kind of a transition as that which seems to have taken place in Latin. To this difficulty must be added the fact that there was considerable difference in detail in the treatment of the quantitative rhythm in the two languages, so that in practice the rhythmical schemes were not identical, but only similar.

But there is still another difficulty in the way of the explanation offered by Prof. Hendrickson. His argument may be stated as follows: granting that Greek quantitative clausulae had in themselves no suggestion of the accentual Forms which were

to be, there is still the possibility that *accented* syllables came to be substituted for *long* syllables; this substitution may have been conscious or unconscious—the result would have been the same. There is abundant evidence, as Prof. Hendrickson points out, to show that as early as the second century B. C. the confusion between accented syllables and long syllables was common. Both in inscriptions and papyri long vowels are often found written in the place of short vowels, when they bear a word accent; and long unstressed vowels are wrongly written as short. This must be accounted for by the influence of the spoken language, in which the pitch accent was giving way to the stress accent. It is therefore perfectly reasonable to believe that the writers of rhythmical prose were influenced by this confusion to allow accented syllables (long or short) to take the place of long syllables; in the course of time quantity would entirely disappear as an element in the rhythm, and word accent would stand in its place.

The process which is supposed to have taken place may be outlined as follows. Starting with the typical quantitative clausula *δεινὸς ἄνθρωπος*, there are three long syllables for which accented syllables might have been substituted: *δεινός* might have been replaced by such a word as *ὄδε*; but what is to become of the last word? Both longs cannot be turned into stressed syllables, for we must suppose that the two-word clausula with the feminine caesura will be retained. Naturally the word accent will be used in place of that one of the two longs which carries the heavier metrical stress. Now the cretic foot is believed to have been the basis of all quantitative clausulae in the Asianic rhythm, and it is to be expected that the individuality of this unit will be retained at the sacrifice of everything else, for the hypothesis supposes that *the quantitative units are to be translated into terms of word accent*. But there is no trace of an accentual cretic in the accentual clausulae; rather it is rigidly avoided. No writer treats as regular such a close as *μέγα μίαισμα*, which might fairly be said to give in terms of accent the effect of the quantitative unit cretic + trochee. It is necessary, therefore, to account for the disappearance of the cretic by proving that accent was substituted for quantity only in the thesis (in the Greek sense) of the *trochee*. We should then get the desired result, namely two unstressed syllables between the two word accents. For example the rhythm of *δεινὸς ἄνθρωπος* might be represented by *ὄδε πανούργος*. This is the crux of the whole matter, and until it is conclusively proved

that the one substitution was avoided (that in the second thesis of the cretic), while the other was favored, the whole theory is involved in uncertainty. The evidence found by Prof. Hendrickson in the Epistle to the Corinthians is hardly sufficient to prove this point, but as far as it goes it bears out the view that accent *was* substituted for quantity by preference in the thesis of the trochee: the form ἀλήθεια does not stand as a final word in clausulae, although when preceded by a long syllable (e. g., καὶ ἀλήθεια), it makes a correct quantitative clausula; but the clausula τῆς ἀληθείας (quantitatively equivalent to καὶ ἀλήθεια) does occur. Similarly such a phrase as καὶ ταπείνωσις is not found as a clausula, but there are cases like καὶ ταπεινώσει. Apart from this peculiar treatment of these two words, Prof. Hendrickson finds nothing to prove that accent tended to replace quantity *only* in the first thesis of the cretic and in the thesis of the trochee.

These general difficulties in the way of Prof. Hendrickson's theory are sufficient to bring it into grave doubt; but it is further found to be inconsistent with the facts revealed by an examination of the clausulae of different Greek writers of the fourth century and before. Tests have been made in some twenty five Greek writers, beginning with Dio Chrysostom and Clement of Rome in the first century, and ending with Cyril and Proclus in the fifth century. Since Clement is the writer chiefly concerned in Prof. Hendrickson's argument, his case may be now presented, not only for its own sake, but because it may be regarded as typical of what is to be expected in any Greek writer before the middle of the fourth century. Considering the matter from its general aspect, the following principle must be a correct one: if there is such a partial transfer to an accentual principle in the marking of the rhythm in clausulae as that which Prof. Hendrickson supposes, some suggestion of the accentual scheme must be apparent when all the clausulae are read accentually; in other words, statistics should show that the preferred Forms of accentual clausulae show some tendency to predominate over the accentual Forms which were avoided when the accentual rhythm was well established; there should be, therefore, more clausulae which read accentually as Form 2 or 4 than those which read as Form 0, 1, 3 or 5.¹ But a test shows that this is not true; the

¹ Clausulae are classified according to the number of unstressed syllables which separate the last two accents of a clause, the numeral in each case giving the number of such syllables. The position of the caesura and the

different accentual Forms occur in a proportion which must be regarded as purely accidental; there is no tendency to group accents in clausulae in any definite sequences. It is therefore beside the point to look for any transition from the quantitative to the accentual scheme, or any compromise between the two principles in this writer. If a tendency toward a preference for the regular accentual Forms cannot be demonstrated in this general way, the detailed evidence which Professor Hendrickson has found can have no standing whatever.

The results of the tests made in some of the Greek writers are here given in tabular form;¹ the usage of these writers may be regarded as typical of the conditions which may be expected in any writer before and after the introduction of the accentual rhythm. All figures give *percentages*.

	Form 0	Form 1	Form 2	Form 3	Form 4	Form 5	Form 6
Dio Chrysostom ...	7.5	12	34.5	19	19.5	4.5	3
Clement of Rome ..	2.35+	8.37+	40.05+	24.86+	20.15+	2.61+	1.57+
Aelius Aristides ...	1	15.5	37	21	21	3.5	1
Clement of Alexan.	2.5	7	35	29.5	21.5	3.5	1
Porphyry	4	8	38	33	10.5	4.5	2
Libanius	3.1 +	19.1 +	41.4 +	17.5 +	12.7 +	4.7 +	1.0 +
Himerius	1.3 +	16.2 +	72.9 +	4.0 +	4.0 +	.9 +	.4 +
Themistius87+	8.31+	35.79+	12.08+	40.90+	3.90+	2.68+
Julian	3.3 +	19	38.6 +	21.3 +	14.6 +	2	1
Basilius Magnus ...	1.3 +	7.3 +	43.8 +	6.8 +	37.1 +	2.1 +	1.3 +
Gregory of Nazianz.	3	10	40	3.5	40.5	1	2
John Chrysostom ..	2.8	15.4	38.2	15.2	22.2	5.2	1
Synesius	2.04+	5.60+	58.80+	4.62+	25.56+	0	3.34+

number of syllables which follow the last accent are details which may be disregarded in making tests which are intended to do nothing more than show that the accentual rhythm is or is not present. The different Forms may be illustrated as follows:

Form 0 φυσικοῖς δόγμασιν

“ 1 εἰς ἦθος τείνει

“ 2 εὐδαίμονος βίου

regular

“ 3 ῥήτορος ἀνδρός

“ 4 Δίων ὁ Προναειὺς

regular

“ 5 μὴδὲν προσπεριεργαζόμενοι

“ 6 κίνδυνος καταφρονηθῆναι

regular (?)

¹Nothing more is claimed for these figures than was claimed in the case of the Latin writers; the tests have been of the same sort, and serve the same purpose.

It is clear that in the clausulae of all the writers who are earlier than Himerius there is no approximation to the accentual scheme; no preference is shown for the set of regular accentual Forms. Only two deserve to be noted especially; these are the two sophists, Dio Chrysostom and Aelius Aristides. It is a striking fact that in both of these Form 4 is found to occur as often as Form 3, and in the former it actually outnumbers Form 3 by a very small margin. But the total of all regular Forms together is so low that this relation between Forms 3 and 4 must be regarded as accidental, and the effect of the accentual rhythm cannot be said to be even faintly produced.

In the sophist Himerius (c. 315 — 386) is found the first observance of an accentual law; he makes perfectly clear a preference for Form 2, as is shown by the fact that about 73% of all his clausulae fall into this class. His treatment of Form 4 seems to show that he did not regard this as a desirable Form, but counted it among those which were avoided. Form 3 is likewise avoided. Form 1 occurs rather frequently (16.2+%) but it is plainly avoided in comparison with Form 2. There is no doubt that there is in Himerius an accentual law which had been observed by none of his predecessors.¹ That law consists in practically limiting the regular or preferred accentual Forms to one particular Form, namely Form 2. This narrow limitation to one accentual Form fits perfectly what we know of the later use of the rhythm in Greek: there were two distinct tendencies: one class of writers interpreted the law in the broader sense in which the Latin writers understood it, using either Form 2 or 4 (or 6), while others sought the cadence of Form 2 without variation.² A conspicuous example of the latter class was Sophronius (VII cent.), while others are not lacking. It seems

¹ Meyer allowed himself to be strangely deceived in regard to Himerius. After quoting a number of irregular clausulae (Form 0 and 1), he says: "Demnach hat Himerius wenigstens mit meiner Regel von dem accentuirten Satzschlusse durchaus nichts zu tun" (Ges. Abh. II, p. 215). His method of testing by gathering all the irregular clausulae from a limited space is entirely misleading; the statistics of *all* Forms as given above show a condition which he apparently never suspected. In the same way he was misled in the case of Porphyry: "Dagegen fand ich schon bei Porphyrius solche falsche Schlüsse auffallend wenige" (ib.). The complete statistics show that Meyer's Law was absolutely unknown to Porphyry.

² This narrower interpretation of the law seems not to have found favor with any Latin writer.

certain that this stricter interpretation of the law begins with Himerius.

At nearly the same time that Himerius was using the accentual rhythm, the sophist Themistius was also observing an accentual law in his *clausulae*. But the statistics show that his understanding of the law was the broader one which gave preference to Forms 4 as well as to Form 2. (It would seem that Form 6 is not accepted by him as a regular Form.) The range which is given to Form 4 is remarkable; in no other writer, as far as I know, is this Form used actually more than Form 2.¹

In these two writers, then, we have the first observance of an accentual law which had not before been hinted at; there were not two laws, but two interpretations of the same law.² The cause of the difference we can only guess at; perhaps one of the sophists thought to improve on the style set by his rival, and in so doing carried the matter to the extreme shown above. We must hesitate to admit that such a striking difference was due to accident only, for the style of each must have been well known to the other. It may well be that the difference in their schooling had much to do with the matter.

Before passing to the question where Himerius and Themistius found the accentual rhythm, we may pause a moment to notice an interesting chain of influence by which the trick of this rhythm was passed on from teacher to pupil. Among the great number of those who were attracted to the school of Himerius in Athens were two young men who later became leaders in the Christian Church, Basilus Magnus and Gregory of Nazianzus. Now these very men are the first Christian writers in whom there appears an observance of the accentual rhythm; Gregory of Nyssa, who was the brother of Basil, also used the rhythm. It is further known that Gregory of Nazianzus was an admirer of Themistius. There can be no doubt that the use of the accentual rhythm in these three writers is to be explained as due to the influence of Himerius and perhaps Themistius.³ It is true that the law which they follow is the broader form of the law rather

¹ There is a suggestion of the same fondness for Form 4 in some of the writings of Gregory of Nazianzus; e. g., *Orat.* VI.

² The introduction of the accentual rhythm into Greek is dated too late by Meyer—about 400 A. D.—v. *Ges. Abh.* II, pp. 269, 270.

³ The influence of Themistius seems especially plain in Gregory of Nazianzus, whose *clausulae* show an unusually high percentage of Form 4.

than that form which Himerius adopted for his own use, but it still seems certain that this adoption of a style new in Christian writings was due to the influence of the teaching of their earlier years.

This hypothesis receives some support from the contrast which appears between the style of these three writers and that of two who are known to have been strongly influenced by Libanius. In the works of Libanius himself there is no observance of the accentual law, and in his famous school of oratory in Antioch the rhythm which his two contemporaries had adopted must have been completely disregarded. Now it is known that the Emperor Julian was under the influence of this teacher in his younger years; Libanius became acquainted with the young Prince during the time when he was teaching in Nicomedia, and after Julian had ascended the throne continued to enjoy the favor of the Emperor until his early death in 363. It is therefore the most natural thing in the world that the writings of Julian show no use of the accentual rhythm. The case is not quite so clear for John Chrysostom, who attended the school in Antioch, and won great favor with the master, though he later sorely disappointed him by turning Christian. The accentual rhythm was plainly known to Chrysostom, but it was used by him in such a half-hearted way that he must have regarded it as incidental. Certain it is, he had not learned it from Libanius. He may have caught the trick from the contemporary Christian writers, but his comparative disregard for that particular stylistic device was evidently due to his early training in the school at Antioch.

We have now seen that the accentual rhythm makes its first appearance in the writings of two teachers of oratory and rhetoric. There may be something significant in this very fact; it is to be expected that innovations in style should be introduced by just these men. The new rhythm was something which appealed to the popular ear, and it was doubtless adopted for this very reason. It is also clear that no sign of this rhythm is to be found in writers before the middle of the fourth century; there is nothing even approximating a gradual development. Where, then, was the suggestion found which led Himerius and Theodoretus to use these particular accentual Forms in clausulae? It has already been shown that the explanation given above for the rise of the rhythm in Latin writers cannot be applied to Greek

writers. It is also clear that Prof. Hendrickson's theory is not in keeping with the facts.

Only one piece of evidence is now needed in order to set everything in a clear light. If there was a transition from the Greek quantitative rhythm to the accentual rhythm, there must have been traces of a quantitative scheme in the clausulae of those writers who are first found using the new rhythm. That is, we may look for exactly the same condition as that found in Ammianus—an accentual rhythm which pays some regard to quantity. This stage would be later in time than the intermediate stage which Professor Hendrickson believes he has found, and is just as necessary a stage. The writers in whom we may look for this lingering observance of quantity are, of course, Himerius and Themistius; to these may be added Synesius, Bishop of Cyrene, who wrote at the end of the fourth century.

It is necessary that the commonest Form of accentual clausula (Form 2) should show the remains of the earlier quantitative scheme if they are present. Only the two stressed syllables and the two syllables between the stresses need be regarded, and it must be shown that there is a plain tendency to make long both the stressed syllables, and above all the second of the unstressed syllables. There must be a suggestion of the sequence — ∪ — — (∪), and this suggestion should appear in the relative quantities of the two unstressed syllables at least; for it is clear that quantity must have been observed in unstressed syllables longer than in stressed syllables where the presence of the accent would excuse the neglect of quantity. In the same way those accentual clausulae which have four unstressed syllables between the two stresses should give a suggestion of the quantitative clausula — ∪ — — ∪ — (∪). But it is plain, as is shown by the following statistics, that none of these writers pay any regard to syllabic quantities in their clausulae; the arrangement of longs and shorts is guided by no rule and there is not the slightest suggestion of the cretic base of the quantitative rhythm.

In the following tables the different syllables of clausulae are designated according to the position in which they stand; in clausulae of Form 2 the syllable which bears the leading stress is called Thesis 1; this is followed by two unstressed syllables, which are called Arsis 1 and Arsis 2 respectively; these in turn are followed by the last accented syllable which is called Thesis 2; the syllables (if there be any) which follow Thesis 2 are called

Arsis 3 and Arsis 4—these are not considered in the tests for quantity. A similar nomenclature is applied to clausulae of Form 4.

Themistius.

Orat. XIX (ed. Petavius), all cases of Form 2 before heavy punctuation (counting a vowel before the combination mute plus liquid as always long, and long final vowels or diphthongs in weak hiatus as short; eliding according to the demands of the accentual rhythm).

Thesis 1	long	41 (56.9 + %)	short	31
Arsis 1	"	44 (61.1 + %)	"	28
Arsis 2	"	41 (56.9 + %)	"	31
Thesis 2	"	43 (59.7 + %)	"	29

All the syllables have a slight tendency to be long; there is no trace of any quantitative rhythm.

Orat. IX (ed. Petavius), all cases of Form 4 before heavy punctuation, counting as before.

Thesis 1	long	45 (56.2 + %)	short	35
Arsis 1	"	57 (71.2 + %)	"	23
Arsis 2	"	30 (37.5 + %)	"	50
Arsis 3	"	27 (33.7 + %)	"	53
Arsis 4	"	39 (48.7 + %)	"	41
Thesis 2	"	52 (65%)	"	28

The quantitative sequence suggested by these eighty clausulae is — — ∪ ∪ ∪ —; from this comes no hint of the quantitative rhythm. The sequence which should be found if traces of the quantitative scheme are being sought is — ∪ — — ∪ — (∪).

Himerius.

Orat. VIII, XIII and XXIII (ed. Wernsdorf) all cases of Form 2 before heavy punctuation, counting as in Themistius.

	Orat. VIII		Orat. XIII		Orat. XXII		Average
	long	short	long	short	long	short	long
Thesis 1	23	13	20	11	16	16	59.5 + %
Arsis 1	26	10	18	13	28	4	72.7 + %
Arsis 2	23	13	11	20	20	12	54.5 + %
Thesis 2	24	12	24	7	20	12	68.6 + %

There is surely no suggestion of the sequence — ∪ — — (∪); the syllable which seems to show a tendency to be long is the very one which would be expected to be short (Arsis 1).

Synesius.

In three different parts of the *Dion* (Migne: *Patrologia Graeca* 66) 100 consecutive clausulae of Form 2 were counted (*omitting* all cases involving hiatus, and all those in which there is a vowel followed by a mute and liquid).

		A		B		C		Average long
		long	short	long	short	long	short	
Thesis	1	47	53	57	43	61	39	55%
Arsis	1	64	36	61	39	61	39	62%
Arsis	2	56	44	55	45	63	37	58%
Thesis	2	53	47	64	36	70	30	62.3 +%

The result is strikingly similar to that obtained from *Themistius*; there is certainly not the faintest residuum of the quantitative rhythm.

In order to make sure that this method of testing for quantities in the accentual clausulae of Greek writers has been a fair one, a test of exactly the same sort was made in three Latin writers. A number of clausulae which are read accentually as Form 2 and an equal number of Form 4 were examined to see what relation syllabic quantities hold to the accentual Forms. The result shows, as would be expected, a very close correspondence between the two schemes.

Form 2		Arnobius		Symmachus		Firmicus	
		long	short	long	short	long	short
Thesis	1	29	1	28	2	30	0
Arsis	1	4	26	3	27	8	22
Arsis	2	28	2	27	3	26	4
Thesis	2	29	1	22	8	23	7

The quantitative Form suggested is the commonest of the regular Forms: — ∪ — — (∪).

Form 4		Arnobius		Symmachus	
		long	short	long	short
Thesis	1	22	8	22	8
Arsis	1	0	30	0	30
Arsis	2	22	8	23	7
Arsis	3	26	4	23	7
Arsis	4	5	25	7	23
Thesis	2	29	1	29	1

The quantitative Form here suggested is one of very frequent occurrence in the quantitative rhythm: — ∪ — — ∪ — (∪).

These tests make it perfectly plain that in those Greek writers who first use accentual clausulae, there is no quantitative law

observed in connection with the accentual Forms. In contrast with this it is plain that in the Latin writers in whom the regular accentual Forms are first found to predominate, the accentual scheme is closely involved with the traditional quantitative rhythm.

It has now been shown that the accentual rhythm makes its first appearance in Greek about the middle of the fourth century in the writings of the Sophists Himerius and Themistius; that in Greek writers before that time there is no trace of the accentual scheme, and that neither in Himerius nor Themistius nor Synesius is there any trace of a quantitative law. On the other hand the accentual scheme makes its first appearance in Latin at the end of the third century, and for at least a century was closely involved in the quantitative rhythm. Add to this that the accentual law was practically the same in the two languages, and only one conclusion is possible: the Greek writers took over the accentual scheme from the Latin, disregarding the quantitative law of the Latin clausulae which they may or may not have observed in their model. It is true that both Himerius and Themistius gave an individual turn to the rhythm, the one by elevating the importance of Form 2 and the other by showing a preference for Form 4; but not only the idea of marking the cadence of clausulae by word accent, but also the suggestion of the accentual Forms to which preference should be given was derived from the practise of the Latin writers Cyprian or Arnobius or the unknown author of the *Panegyric to Constantius* (No. 5), or some other Latin writer who constructed his clausulae as these writers did.

HENRY B. DEWING.

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY.